SUBJECTS

extent, and that they were generally poor and could not afford to pay the acreage value and get waste lands registered in their names under the rules. In their order No. 3927/ L. R., dated the 16th April 1911, the Government had absolutely prohibited *malavaram* cultivation. In the peculiar condition of the taluk, the rule operated as a great hardship on the poor people. The Member therefore prayed that the Government might be pleased to permit *malavaram* cultivation by the ryots of the taluk on payment by them of a light tax and on their agreeing in writing to take due care of the trees standing on the lands.

Dewan's reply.—The Government will not go back on their order prohibiting *malavaram* cultivation.

10. The necessity for the remission of the land-tax when cultivation fails.

Mr. G. A. Baker (Member, Nominated) represented that, in South Travancore, the Government allowed remission of tax in cases where cultivation wholly failed, but the concession was not applicable to Central Travancore. The Member admitted that the ryots had plenty of water in Central Travancore, but the cultivation often failed owing to too much of water. He failed to see why the rule should not be extended to Central Travancore also. He suggested that some department, preferably the Agricultural Department, be asked to inspect the lands on the application of the ryots and to take steps to remit the tax in cases of complete failure of crops.

Dewan's reply.—The Dewan Peishkar will be asked to report on the matter.

11. The treatment of certain registered holdings as Porambokes in the Land Records Maintenance work now going on in the Neyyattinkara taluk.

Mr. Kanakku Ayyappan Narayanan (Member, Neyyattinkara taluk) said that as much as three-fourths of the lands which were being treated as *porambokes* in the Land Records Maintenance work now going on in the taluk were really registered holdings. That would be evident from the circumstance that the trees on them had been assessed in the Settlement of 1012, and also from the age of the trees, some of which being as old as 60 years. In the Survey of the taluk in 1064 M. E., the demarcation stones on the banks of rivers and canals and on the sides of roads were planted far into the adjoining registered lands. When the owners of those lands objected, they were told that the stones were so planted to prevent their being washed away or otherwise tampered with, that the position of those stones would not affect their rights and that the ryots would be granted pattas at the Settlement for the *full* extent of their holdings. But at the Settlement, the ryots were given pattas only for such areas as were apparently in their possession from the position of the demarcation stones and the excess areas were in all cases recorded as *porambokes*. The ryots however did not know it at the time, because the original measurements of the holdings were carefully omitted to be shown in the rough pattas (*thelivucheets*) issued to them. The Land Records staff rigidly followed the treatment at the Settlement and the ryots now realised for the first time that many of their registered holdings had in that way become *porambokes*. Action was also being taken against the holders under Regulation II of 1067 and the so-called encroachments were asked to be vacated. A few of the ryots had preferred appeals to the Government,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

but the many poor among them submitted to the decisions of the Revenue authorities owing to the want of means to prefer appeals. The Member said that, when the Dewan visited the place recently, the ryots, in a body, had represented their grievances and that they did not know the result of their representations.

Further, there were in the taluk some lands which were really *porambokes*, being outside the registered holdings. At present, those lands, though they had been long in the possession and enjoyment of individual ryots, were not being registered in their names, but the trees standing on them were alone leased out on *kuthagapattom*. The Member therefore prayed for the following reliefs :—

(1) In the case of the registered holdings which were being treated as *porambokes*, the Government should look into the appeals from the *poramboke* decisions already preferred and, in other instances, send for the records and dispose of the cases in the exercise of their power of revision. Such lands, including the trees on them, should be treated as old *pathiras* and their registry in the names of the respective holders should be ordered without demanding any *vila yartham*. He pointed out that a similar order was issued by the Government at the time of the settlement of the Trivandrum taluk in Jamabundy No. 4111, dated the 5th Makaram 1063.

(2) In the case of the real *porambokes*, such of them as on careful examination were not required for Government purposes should be permanently registered in the names of the occupants, on payment of *vilayartham*, and, in the case of the rest, the present practice of leasing the trees standing on the lands might be continued.

Dewan's reply.—The matter will be enquired into.

12. The necessity for the transfer of the Cherukole, Mallapuzhasseri and Aranmula pakuthies from the Thiruvalla to the Chengannur taluk.

Mr. P. Narayana Pillai (Member, Chengannur taluk) said that two-thirds of the lands in the *pakuthies* of Cherukole, Mallapuzhasseri and Aranmula belonged to the Jenmis in the Vadakkekara *pakuthi* in the Chengannur taluk. They were now put to very great inconveniences as the revenue jurisdiction of those *pakuthies* vested with the Thiruvalla Tahsildar. All the three *pakuthies* were situated on the southern side of the Pampa river and closer to Chengannur than to Thiruvalla, the distances from the centre of each of them to Chengannur being 3, 7 and 10 miles respectively against 10, 16 and 18 miles to Thiruvalla, and the people of the *pakuthies* had to go past the Chengannur Taluk Cutcherry on their way to the Thiruvalla Taluk Cutcherry. It was evidently in view of those circumstances that the Government had transferred the criminal jurisdiction of the *pakuthies* of Mallapuzhasseri and Cherukole to the Pathanamthitta Magistrate and the civil jurisdiction of all the three *pakuthies* to the Chengannur Munsiff; but the revenue jurisdiction remained unchanged. The Member therefore prayed that the Government might be pleased to transfer the revenue jurisdiction of the three *pakuthies* from the Thiruvalla to the Chengannur Tahsildar.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly